

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY**

Cheryl Ackerman,

Plaintiff,

v.

David Wolff, Esq.

Defendant.

Civ. No. 18-11860 (KM)

OPINION

The plaintiff, Cheryl Ackerman, has brought a series of actions and applications, most in the form of appeals from orders of the Bankruptcy Court in Case No. 17-7032. Because of repetitive filings seeking the same relief, the bankruptcy court entered an order limiting the filing of new motions. This court's most recent ruling dismissed a bankruptcy appeal as moot in light of the court-ordered sale of Ms. Ackerman's property. (18 cv 8045 DE 34) Now Ms. Ackerman has brought a civil complaint against the trustee in bankruptcy, David Wolff, asserting many of the same matters that were the subject of her bankruptcy appeals. By order and opinion dated March 6, 2019, I dismissed the complaint in this matter (a) because the plaintiff, despite the grant of extensions, had not served the complaint, and (b) on screening pursuant to the *in forma pauperis* statute, 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e), because the complaint did not state an intelligible federal-law cause of action. The clerk closed the file, as directed.

On March 26, 2019, the plaintiff filed an "Emergent Motion." (DE 18) It is in substance a motion for reconsideration, and I treat it as such. It contains a number of disjointed medical complaints and financial grievances, many of which presumably were the subject of bankruptcy court proceedings. Much of the relief sought seems to be directed at reopening or reversing the orders of the bankruptcy court, although this particular action is not an appeal from


such orders.

In short, there is no argument in this motion that was not or could not have been brought in the earlier proceedings. There is no basis to grant reconsideration. See D.N.J. Loc. Civ. R. 7.1(i); *North River Ins. Co. v. CIGNA Reinsurance Co.*, 52 F.3d 1194, 1218 (3d Cir. 1995).

ORDER

IT IS this 29th day of March, 2019

ORDERED that the motion (DE 18) is DENIED, and that this action is and remains DISMISSED for the reasons expressed in my earlier Opinion and Order (DE 16, 17).


KEVIN MCNULTY
United States District Judge